



Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact support@jstor.org.

Practice and Prospect

Edited by J. J. SCHLICHER

THE HIGH-SCHOOL LATIN AUTHORS

The choice of high-school authors in Latin is largely determined by factors outside of the high school. The most potent of these has always been the specific college-entrance requirement. And this has, to all appearances, been made so specific without any very adequate reason, either in the needs of the college or in those of the high school. But it has been a fact, nevertheless, and has naturally led to the publication of numerous editions of those parts of particular authors which were mentioned in the college catalogues, to the exclusion of the rest; so that, even if the teacher wished to do so, he could not exercise much choice in the reading of his class, owing to the lack of suitable editions. More than that, the books in Latin composition have in the course of time all been based, more or less directly, upon these specific portions of Caesar and Cicero, and, if the teacher wishes to use these books to best advantage, he must perforce read the parts of these authors just as they are presupposed in the composition books. More recently we have had a *Vocabulary* and a *Syntax* of High-School Latin, both useful books, which appear to take these limitations for granted, as if they were ordained to continue, or were inherent in the nature of things.

Now, other things being equal, it is easier to teach Latin in this way, and certain results can, no doubt, be reached more quickly. Efficiency of a kind is gained, but it is a narrow efficiency, and narrowing in its effects. If we aim only at that, we leave out of account what will always be the most important factor in the whole situation—the teacher himself. Isolated as he usually is, and overloaded with class work, he is robbed by such a practice as this, of any incentive he might otherwise have to extend his acquaintance with classical authors, ancient history, or ancient life, beyond that required by the routine reading of his class.

Two results inevitably follow. The teacher's dealing with his subject, while it may become externally more perfect, becomes also more restricted in its outlook from year to year, and, finally, more mechanical in its methods. It is not only the spirit of inquiry, and the keenness for new light on the author himself that is lost, but with it, and inseparable from it, also the interest in the relation between the work and the class. For by long habit the teacher comes finally to do his work more or less automatically, and without that vitalizing grapple with new ideas and situations upon which his whole progress depends.

And in the second place, the restricted routine of reading cuts off the high-school teacher from touch with the larger field in which he works. Having no

occasion, and little time, to keep posted on anything but his own narrow round, he soon loses interest in all the rest. It is futile to offer classical magazines to those who will only at long intervals find in them anything that has even the remotest bearing on what they themselves are doing year after year. If the extent of their province bore any sort of respectable relation to that of classical scholarship as a whole, we should not, as we now are, be confronted more and more plainly with the prospect of a complete divorce between the interests of the secondary school and those of the university.

A wider range of reading in the high school would have a good effect in still another line. For every author that the teacher takes up and studies over with a view to adapting it to the needs of his class is itself, in a way, a piece of independent and pioneer work with him, and so, an important cultivation of his powers, of which he is largely deprived by a practice of reading the same thing every year.

The writer has for some time felt that this matter is one of the very first importance, deserving the attention not only of the secondary teachers themselves, but of the colleges and universities. For the latter depend upon and work with the product of the high schools, and in turn must prepare teachers for them. If the work of the high school is not sound and vigorous, it involves all other work as well. It is to throw some light on the situation that the information which is presented in this article was gathered.

Second year.—The two Latin authors who are most commonly considered as available for the reading of the second year divide the field very unevenly between them. The *Gallic War* is read everywhere, while the *Biographies* of Nepos, if used at all, are as a rule used only during a part of the year, generally the last part. Still the number of teachers who have read Nepos in their classes is not so small as appears to be generally thought. Of those who replied to this question, something over half had done so, and with most of these it has become a regular part of their practice. Nepos is read much more extensively in the East than in the West. About 75 per cent of the teachers in the New England and Middle states had used him in their classes, as against only 33 per cent in the rest of the country. And in the latter section the older states of the Middle West and those of the Pacific coast are rather more favorable toward Nepos than the rest.

A few of those who have made an attempt to read Nepos in the second year seem to have had very bad luck. For they speak of it with the air of people who cannot be fooled more than once. But these are exceptions. The great majority of those who have used Nepos find an advantage in doing so, especially during a part of the year. Compared with Caesar he is found to be slightly more difficult, though not so uneven in difficulty. It may be, as several teachers suggest, that this greater difficulty is only apparent, and that it arises from the fact that our beginner's books are so often constructed with a view to preparing for Caesar. The most generally recognized advantage of Nepos, as one would expect, is found in the greater interest and

the greater variety of his subject-matter. The objection to Nepos on the ground that his Latin is not good, because it is not exactly the same as that of Cicero in all its usages, is certainly one that deserves soon to be laid in its grave. People do not all write alike, even today, and it would be a weary world, if they did.

On the other hand, it must not be assumed that the general use of Caesar is due to his being found entirely satisfactory for the work of the second year. Of 115 who replied to this question, only 46 consider the *Gallic War* to be the right sort of book for the purpose; 24 find it lacking in variety, 26 in interest to the children, and 19 too difficult. Now, fortunately, the two most serious of these objections can be met by the use of Nepos, for, as we saw, variety and interest are precisely the qualities in which teachers generally find him to be superior. It is a pity, therefore, that so little freedom is still allowed in many places, or felt to exist, in the matter of the high-school authors. All teachers are not alike, nor all classes, and those qualities of an author which work well in one case may lead to comparative failure in another. It is certainly not too much to ask that in each case the tools that yield the best results should be fully and freely available.

The answers to the question in what order the books of Caesar should be read are in at least five-sixths of the cases evidently based on the assumption that the first four books of the *Gallic War* are meant. Of these teachers, somewhat less than half think that they should be read in their regular order. These who do not think so are again divided about evenly into two sections. Half of them—for the most part in New England—begin with Book II, and read Book I later on in the year. The other half—chiefly in the Middle West—begin with Book I, but read only the Helvetian campaign (sometimes only to chap. xii), and then pass from chap. xxix directly to the second book, leaving the campaign with Ariovistus (chaps. xxx–liv) until some time later, nearly always till the last thing in the year. A few would omit Book I altogether. Something over a dozen, particularly on the Pacific coast, believe in reading selections instead of reading complete books. But even this show of independence will be found in many cases to be due to the teacher's using a book of selections instead of a complete text of Caesar.

Discouraging as this situation is, it is easily explained. Most people prefer to read over ground with which they are thoroughly familiar even if their leisure is greater than that of the average high-school teacher. Then, also, the complete editions of the *Gallic War* in most cases have careful and adequate notes only on the first four books. But for all that, it is true, as several teachers say, that the subject-matter of the last three books is, on the whole, considerably more varied and generally more interesting than that of the first four. The view that the second-year's reading is good only for a drill ground in grammar, and that nothing else need take up the teacher's attention, is fortunately found only in a very few instances. With all their shortcomings, pupils will always get more from their instruction in some

respects, than what is aimed at directly in the teaching, and, whatever may be the teacher's idea as to the main object of the year's work, the other avenues should at least be kept open and all possible obstacles removed from them. And lastly, there is no good reason for saying that the reading matter of the second year lacks variety or interest on the part of those who have never given Nepos a fair trial, nor have even explored all the possibilities of the *Gallic War* itself.

Third year.—In the third year, out of 141 teachers, 50 had, in addition to Cicero's orations, read some of his letters, 51 had read Sallust's *Catiline*, 7 the *Jugurthine War*, 13 the *De senectute*, 1 the *De amicitia*, 2 the *Civil War*, and 5 the prose version of the *Phormio*, recently published by Fairclough & Richardson. The letters are read rather more extensively in the West than in the East, while the opposite is true of the *De senectute* and Sallust. The *Phormio*, with one exception, was read only in the far West.

It should be stated that the more extensive reading in the eastern states is often due to a Latin course of five or six years. In four-year courses Sallust's *Catiline* is very frequently read at sight or in selections, supplementary to the *Orations against Catiline*.

About one-fourth of the replies state that the works just mentioned are not so good for third-year reading as the orations, or that they are not suitable for other reasons. The *De senectute* is quite generally found to be too advanced chiefly on account of the character of the contents and the somewhat philosophical nature of the reasoning. In regard to the *Jugurthine War* the chief criticism seems to be the lack of a suitable edition. The *Catiline* is spoken of most frequently as good supplementary reading, while the points made in favor of the letters are their inherent interest and the light they throw on Cicero and Roman life. It is stated by way of criticism, and justly, as it seems to the writer, that the selection of letters now often printed in the same book with the orations is not as a rule well made. The experience with the simplified *Phormio* appears to have been entirely successful, so far as it has gone. Every teacher who has used it speaks enthusiastically of the interest with which the class took it up.

In some places where the *Catiline* of Sallust was used in whole or part, it displaced one or more of the *Orations against Catiline*, the two being dovetailed into each other so as to make a more complete whole. For there is, undoubtedly, as several teachers express themselves, a danger of getting "too much *Catiline*."

When the Committee on College-Entrance Requirements in Latin named the *Orations against Catiline*, for the *Manilian Law* and for *Archias*, as representing the amount to be read, it was not intended that these should be given preference over others, except as a special case was made of the two last named. But it appears that these six orations are in actual practice the ones which are read most frequently. There is, however, a very commendable and rather widespread disposition to break away from this confinement. Especially in

regard to the speeches against Catiline it is thought by many that one, if not more, might very profitably be omitted, and other reading substituted for them.

The vote on which of the four might be omitted, is interesting, and most people will agree with it. Out of 141 teachers 3 think the first oration could be omitted; 72 the second; 24 the third; 28 the fourth. In a few cases the statement is made that parts of the orations mentioned should be left out. In regard to the second oration some say that it gives practically nothing new, and others object to the characterization of Catiline's followers which it contains. What disposition there is to leave out the third, is found chiefly with those who use Sallust's *Catiline* as supplementary reading, and thus get the story of the discovery of the conspiracy, which the third oration also contains. One interesting suggestion is to read the historical parts of Sallust's *Catiline*, and drop in the first and fourth orations of Cicero at their proper places.

On the question whether one or more of the *Orations against Catiline* should actually be omitted, the vote was 59 to 52. It is thus apparent that the practice is less radical than the personal inclinations of the teachers, and that it is influenced somewhat by other considerations, chiefly among which is the fact that many Latin compositions are so constructed that the omission of one or the other of these orations would result in the loss of just so much of the grammar for that year. There is quite a disposition to substitute something also for the *Manilian Law*, and to put the *Archias* off till the fourth year. And there are some who would put the whole of Cicero off till the fourth year, and read Vergil in the third, contending, with much reason, that the subject-matter of Cicero's orations is meant for grown men and makes little appeal to young pupils.

Among the orations outside of the six mentioned above that for Marcellus has a long lead, 58 having used it, as against 28 for the *Actio prima* against Verres or parts of this and other Verrines, 20 for *Ligarius*, 20 for some oration against Antony, usually the fourth or fourteenth, 16 for the *Pro Roscio*, and 13 for the *Defense of Milo*. Other speeches have but a vote or two each. Perhaps two-thirds of those who have read the orations just named find them good substitutes for the ones they displace on the list of six. Where a specific statement is made, it is generally that they are more interesting to the pupils than the others. Of those mentioned perhaps the one for *Roscius* is found to have least interest for the average class, and both it and the *Milo* are found to be a little more difficult than the rest.

Fourth year.—Of all the authors that have been candidates for a place beside Caesar, Cicero, and Virgil, Ovid has clearly been the most successful. Of the 141 teachers, 90 have read Ovid with their classes; but these figures alone do not tell the whole story. While the vogue of Sallust and Nepos is found largely in the East, that of Ovid extends evenly over the whole country. And it is evident, furthermore, that it is on the increase. The interest in him is reported to be great, almost without exception. The chief reason for

this is, no doubt, that he is in hardly any respect beyond the comprehension and appreciation of the pupils. He is, indeed, often read with good success during the last months of the third year, the chief object being to give those who drop their Latin at the end of that year a taste of Latin poetry.

Virgil, in addition to the first six books of the *Aeneid*, is also read quite extensively. Selections of single books from the last half of the *Aeneid* were read by 46 out of a total of 141, almost exclusively east of the Mississippi and north of the Ohio. The *Eclogues*, in whole or part, were read by 49, all but 14 of whom were in the eastern states. The reading of selections from the *Georgics* is largely confined to New England, 9 out of the total of 16.

Of these various substitutes and additions to *Aeneid* I-VI, Ovid and the selections from the last half of the *Aeneid* are regarded as the most suitable, but Ovid's popularity is far the greater of the two. On the *Eclogues* opinions are about equally divided. Some say that their pupils are much interested in them, while the rest find them rather remote to their comprehension, and more difficult than the other reading. The same is evidently true also of the *Georgics*, though here much seems to depend upon the parts which are chosen.

The popularity of the first six books of the *Aeneid* is very unequal. No one thought that the first could be omitted and only one thought so of the second, and 6 each of the fourth and sixth. But 33 find it possible to dispense with the third, and 73 with the fifth. The fifth book is quite commonly looked upon as nothing better than an interruption of the story. It has some warm friends in classes composed of boys, owing to its subject-matter, which, on the other hand, is anathema to the girls. The universal criticism of the third book is its monotony of incident, and, in some cases, the frequent change of scene without any sufficient variety of events. The difficulties of the sixth book are not able to make much headway against the natural curiosity about its contents, and what objection there is to the fourth is due to the observation that the hero invites the contempt of the boys, or to the view that the whole subject is unfit for mixed classes, or is too far along for them to appreciate. But the paltry six votes show that there is but little heart in the objections after all. The view that the fourth book is not necessary to the narrative seems to be confined to a single individual.

The substitutes proposed for the books thus marked for omission are generally those mentioned above, Ovid leading by a good margin. But other books are also suggested—the *De senectute*, Horace's *Odes*, Catullus, Terence, Curtius, Nepos, Livy, Pliny's *Letters*, the Latin Testament, and various lines of collateral works, such as mythology, Roman life, etc.

The vote upon whether there should be Latin composition in the fourth year results in a sweeping victory for composition—77 for it, 41 against it, and 14 doubtful. The cause of composition, so far as this year is concerned, seems to be strongest in those states of the Middle West to the east of the Mississippi, and weakest in those to the west of it, with the rest of the country more evenly divided.